

faith and development

CENTRE INTERNATIONAL LEBRET-IRFED

49, rue de la Glacière - 75013 Paris - FRANCE

Tel 33(0)1 47 07 10 07 - Fax 33(0)1 47 07 68 66

e-mail: publications@lebret-irfed.org

N° 331 – February-March 2005

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AND THE OBSESSION FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH

by Denis Goulet*

Consensus, though often desirable, can produce harmful effects. It can kill debate. On the other hand, patient efforts at reaching agreement on the meaning of words and objectives can turn out fruitful. For instance, Denis Goulet reveals six different meanings of the phrase “sustainable and equitable development”!, enough matter for discussion, to break away from the simplistic reasoning which continually fed our “messianic enthusiasm” at the end of the 1980s. A “rich and just” society was supposed to come out of the sacred union between the welfare state in the North, and ‘development’ strategies in the South. Results defeated expectations. Wherein lay the problem?

There is no simple answer. Merely accusing the egoism of our political strategies does not explain the situation. The present analysis goes back in time, even referring to Lebre’s investigations in the 1960s – at a time when the

concept of globalization was, of course, not yet in use – and comes up with some “lessons”, of which the main one, in my opinion, is at the heart of the present reflection.

It concerns the role of economic growth. When this latter is taken as the end and not the means, it produces, according to Lebre, as reread by Goulet, “distorted” development, a development which becomes more and more dubious as to the value of its economic base, its ethical points of view and its political consequences. Too much human suffering has refuted its promises.

It is time to open our eyes. Up to now, globalization has not solved the problem of unequal development in the world. This failure should not be reason to give up. It brings us back to the daily task of uncompromising analysis and courageous reflection, to which this article invites us.

Albert Longchamp

Denis Goulet is American, Professor Emeritus occupying the O’Neill Chair in Education for Justice, Department of Economics, University of Notre Dame, Indiana. He was one of the first, in 1957, to initiate the interdisciplinary studies on Development Ethics and has conducted field studies in several Southern countries. He has published 160 articles and monographs as well as 11 books.

For the World Bank¹, the “achievement of sustained and equitable development remains the greatest challenge facing the human race.” It is evident, however, that equitable development has not been achieved: disparities are widening and new poverty is being produced faster than new wealth by economic growth. Clearly, therefore, the kind of development presently pursued must not be sustained.

The World Commission on Environment and Development defines sustainable development as “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.”² The economist Paul Streeten, a former policy advisor to the World Bank, observes however that it is unclear whether one should “be concerned with sustaining the constituents of well-

being or its determinants, whether with the means or the ends. Clearly, what ought to matter are the constituents: the health, welfare and prosperity of the people, and not so many tons of minerals, so many trees, or so many animal species. Yet, some of the writings on the subject confuse the two”³. Matters are still more complex, Streeten adds, because the term “sustainable development” has at

least six different meanings. It can signify the "maintenance, replacement and growth of capital assets, both physical and human; maintaining the physical environmental conditions for the constituents of well-being; the 'resilience' of a system, enabling it to adjust to shocks and crises; avoiding burdening future generations with internal and external debts; fiscal, administrative and political sustainability (a policy must be credible and acceptable to the citizens, so that there is sufficient consent to carry it out;) and the ability to hand over projects to the management by citizens of the developing country in which they are carried out, so that foreign experts can withdraw without jeopardizing their success."

Are development and sustainability compatible?

Whether sustainability and development are compatible is itself a disputed question. The economist Paul Elkin argues that: "the dominant trajectory of economic development since the industrial revolution has been patently unsustainable. There is literally no experience of an environmentally sustainable industrial economy, anywhere in the world, where such sustainability refers to a non-depleting stock of environmental capital"⁴.

Sustainability seems to require simple living in which consumption is limited. As presently conceived, however, development calls for endless economic growth, which may render sustainability impossible by depleting resources and polluting the biosphere beyond recovery.

No consensus exists as to how development can be rendered sustainable. And no consensus exists as to what strategies are best suited to achieve development.

What grows increasingly clear, however, is that regardless of the development path or strategy adopted, sustainability must be assured in five domains: economic, political, social, environmental, and cultural. Long-term economic viability depends on a use of

resources, which does not deplete them irreversibly. Political viability rests on creating for all members of society a stake in its survival: this cannot be achieved unless all enjoy freedom, inviolable personal rights, and believe that the political system within which they live pursues some common good and not mere particular interests.

Environmental sustainability requires the maintenance of abundant diversity of life-forms and bio-systems, a restorative mode of resource use, and disposal of wastes within nature's absorptive limits. And if development is to be socially and culturally sustainable, the foundations of community and symbolic meaning systems must be protected. Otherwise, they will be steamrolled into oblivion under the pretext of submitting to the requirements of scientific and technological "rationality".

Providing satisfactory conceptual, institutional, and behavioural answers to the three value questions listed earlier - the good life, the just society, the sound relation to nature - is what constitutes authentic development. It follows, therefore, that not every nation with a high per capita income is truly developed and only authentic development ought to be sustainable.

Development based on ethical criteria

In a penetrating study of the evolution of the development idea the Swiss historian Gilbert Rist observes that the period from the end of the Second World War to the end of the Soviet empire was marked by two forms of 'development': the first kept up the stock belief that inspired the extension of market society and its colonial expression; while the second was more akin to religious messianism in its voluntarist enthusiasm to establish at once the ideal of a just and affluent society. "*Two parallel mechanisms were thus supposed to hasten the coming of a new era: the Welfare State in the North and 'development' strategies in the South*".

These messianic stirrings died down in the early nineties; the

'globalization' that took their place may be considered a new manifestation of the same belief (adapted to post-modern culture) in which the real and the virtual merge into one. "*Development now withdraws behind its appearances, and persists only in the form of an 'as if', a trompe-l'oeil whose verisimilitude is enough to make us forget its lack of reality. For the banished object is so important that it must be preserved for the time being, if only in the form of a delusion*"⁵. Later in this essay, it will be seen that, in surprising and paradoxical fashion, the convergence of critical streams of assault upon globalization has resurrected what Rist terms "*these messianic stirrings*."

One early voice in defense of ethically-based development is that of Louis-Joseph Lebret, founder of the *Economy and Humanism*⁶ movement and an influential voice in the crafting of *Populorum Progressio*⁷ and other papal documents on development. Lebret defines development as "*the series of transitions, for a given population and all the population groups which comprise it, from a less human to a more human pattern of existence, at the speediest rhythm possible, at the lowest possible cost, while taking into account all the bonds of solidarity which exist (or ought to exist) amongst these populations and population groups*"⁸.

Normative expressions such as "more human" and "less human" are to be understood in the light of Lebret's distinction between *avoir plus* ("to have more") and *être plus* ("to be more"). A society is more human or developed, not when its citizens "have more," but when all are enabled, or endowed with capabilities, "to be more". Material growth and quantitative increase are doubtless needed for genuine human development, but not any kind of growth nor increase obtained at any price. In Lebret's view, the world as a whole remains underdeveloped or falls prey to an illusory antidevelopment so long as a small number of nations or privileged groups remain alienated in an abundance of luxury (facility) goods at the expense of the many who are deprived thereby of their

essential (subsistence) goods. When such situations prevail, rich and poor societies alike suffer from an insufficient satisfaction of their "enhancement" needs.

The requirements of authentic development

Lebret's formulation of the requirements of authentic development – what Rist calls "real" development – although outlined decades ago, remains useful. This is due largely to Lebret's insistence on basing his theories of development on observed empirical conditions and facts in widely diverse settings. Although Lebret died in 1966, he has left a development legacy, which holds several important lessons for today's globalized world setting.⁹

The first lesson is that development decision-makers must study the expressed needs of populations in whose benefit they profess to work. Otherwise decisions are elitist, over-abstract, and risk being reductionist. As early as 1962 the late Max Millikan, a practitioner of econometric analysis in preparing development plans, had noted the importance of consulting the interested populace as to what value sacrifices it was prepared to accept under alternative courses of action.

Writing in the US position paper prepared for United Nations Conference on the Application of Science and Technology for the Benefit of the Less Developed Areas, Millikan declares that: "*The process of arriving at a national plan should be one in which the planners present to the community for discussion a variety of critical choices showing for each alternative the consequences for the society of pursuing that value choice consistently and efficiently. It is only by this process that the community can clarify its individual and social goals*"¹⁰.

Lebret's pre-planning studies offer a systematic way to engage in precisely such consultation¹¹. Lebret likewise insisted on linking micro issues to macro questions. His method of conducting overall surveys in multiple domains (geography, physical infrastruc-

ture, use of space, administrative and institutional arrangements, etc.) followed by micro and macro analyses led to arbitration among competing alternatives which protected experts from viewing development as simple, discrete, unconnected actions.

A third lesson from Lebret for the age of globalization, is the priority of needs over wants or preferences (expressed by effective purchasing power). Like Mannheim, Barbara Ward, and Galbraith, Lebret understood that the needs of the numerous poor cannot be met by the free play of markets. Markets respond to purchasing power.

A market system, wholly uncorrected by institutions of justice, sharing, and solidarity, makes the strong stronger and the weak weaker. Markets as useful tools in a functioning social order have a positive and decentralizing role to play. Markets as masters of society enrich the rich and pauperize the poor¹².

Lebret subscribed to Mannheim's distinction between an organizing principle and a social mechanism. In Mannheim's words: "*Competition or cooperation as mechanisms may exist and serve diverse ends in any society, pre-literate, capitalist and non-capitalist. But in speaking of the capitalist phase of rugged individualism and competition, we think of an all-pervasive structural principle of social organization. This distinction may help to clarify the question whether capitalist competition – allegedly basic to our social structure – need be maintained as a presumably indispensable motivating force. Now, one may well eliminate competition as the organizing principle of the social structure and replace it by planning without eliminating competitions as a social mechanism to serve desirable ends*"¹³.

There is today a growing recognition that markets are embedded, as a sub-system, in a larger societal system. It is this larger societal system which must provide the organizing principle of economic activity and the rules of governance for making market

competition function as a social mechanism at the service of that organizing principle.

Dimensions of "human flourishing"

A fourth lesson drawn from Lebret is that development is multi-dimensional: it embraces economic, social, political, cultural, environmental, and spiritual components of human well-being. Hence his insistence on achieving "balanced" development. All dimensions of "*human flourishing*" (the term favored by present-day philosophers when speaking of development) must be realized, even if tactical or strategic - and temporary - imbalances may need to be pursued along the way. Lebret never tired of insisting that development was for "every person and the whole person" (*tous les hommes et tout l'homme*). As did the UNDP in its early annual *Human Development Reports*, Lebret regarded economic growth as the means and human development as the end. Things go wrong when these are inverted: when economic growth is pursued as though it were the end and not the means. This inversion leads to distorted development and to excessive costs in human suffering and cultural destruction.

The fifth lesson coming in Lebret's legacy is the need to globalize solidarity. His last book, published posthumously, bore the title *Développement = Révolution Solidaire* (Development = A Revolution of Solidarity).

Decades ago another development theorist, the economist John Kenneth Galbraith, argued that the "*final requirement of modern development planning is that it have a theory of consumption (...) a view of what the production is ultimately for. (...) More important, what kind of consumption should be planned?*"¹⁴ A theory of consumption presupposes a theory of needs. And a sound theory of needs posits a hierarchy of importance and urgency around such categories as: needs of the first order, enhancement needs, and luxury needs¹⁵.

Authentic development does not exist when first-order needs of the many are sacrificed in favor of luxury needs of a few. For this reason Erich Fromm judges that "affluent alienation" is no less dehumanizing than "impoverished alienation"¹⁶. Nor is sound development present when enhancement needs are not widely met. For in this case numerous essential *capabilities*, in Sen's terms, needed for human flourishing are absent.

In 1986 (September 15-19) some sixty governmental planners, project managers and social scientists met at a workshop on "Ethical Issues in Development" at the Marga Institute (Sri Lanka Institute for Development Studies) in Colombo, Sri Lanka. They reached a consensus that any adequate definition of development must include the following dimensions¹⁷:

- a *social ingredient* measured as well-being in health, education, housing and employment;
- a *political dimension* embracing such values as human rights, political freedom, legal enfranchisement of persons, and some form of democracy;
- a *cultural element* in recognition of the fact that cultures confer identity and self-worth to people (although *ecological soundness* was not listed separately this was encompassed under the "cultural element" as an essential component of sound development);
- a final dimension one may call the *full-life paradigm*, which refers to meaning systems, symbols, and beliefs concerning the ultimate meaning of life and history.

What is suggested here is that sound development strategies will be oriented toward forms of economic growth whose production package centers on basic needs, job-creation (largely through the adoption of Appropriate Technologies)¹⁸, decentralized public infrastructure investment aimed at producing multiple "poles" of development, an adequate social allocation ration of public expenditures devoted to what the UNDP calls "*human priority concerns*"¹⁹, an incentives policy to favor increased

productivity in low-productivity sectors, and selective linkage and de-linkage with global markets, with primary emphasis on domestic markets²⁰.

In its report on *North-South: A Program for Survival* the Brandt Commission asserted that "*Man-kind has never before had such ample technical and financial resources for coping with hunger and poverty. The immense task can be tackled once the necessary collective will is mobilized. ... Solidarity among men must go beyond national boundaries: we cannot allow it to be reduced to a meaningless phrase. International solidarity must stem both from strong mutual interests in cooperation and from compassion for the hungry*"²¹.

Brutalized or left behind by globalization

Under the single banner of globalization are to be found multiple inter-connected phenomena which provide the basic setting for present-day debates on development. Although no agreement exists as to the precise definition of globalization, its importance is not questioned. Nor is it disputed that globalization connects all societies and individual persons on the globe to a degree and in registers never previously experienced.

One perceptive analyst, Thomas Friedman, sees globalization as having its own logic: it is not viewed as a mere phenomenon or passing trend, but a new international system. In his words: "*Today it is the overarching international system shaping the domestic politics and foreign relations of virtually every country, and we need to understand it as such. ... Today's era of globalization, which replaced the Cold War, is a similar international system, with its own unique attributes. To begin with, the globalization system, unlike the Cold War system, is not static, but a dynamic ongoing process: globalization involves the inexorable integration of markets, nation-states and technologies to a degree never witnessed before - in a way that is enabling individuals corporations and nation-states to*

reach around the world farther, faster, deeper and cheaper than ever before, and in a way that is also producing a powerful backlash from those brutalized or left behind by this new system".

"*The driving idea behind globalization is free-market capitalism – the more you let market forces rule and the more you open your economy to free trade and competition, the more efficient and flourishing your economy will be. Globalization means the spread of free-market capitalism to virtually every country in the world. Globalization also has its own set of economic rules – rules that revolve around opening, deregulating and privatizing your economy*"²².

Globalization extends its reach into diverse realms: economics, finance, culture, technology, information, and governance. Economic activity is now more international than in national terms. And trade, investment, money, technology, ideas, consumer practices, recreational images, individual persons, organized group actions, and cultural goods of all sorts circulate across national borders with ever fewer restrictions and in rapidly increasing volumes.

A two-edged sword

Globalization is a two-edged sword whose observable results are mixed. Previously unimagined advances have been secured in numerous domains: wealth has been created, technology diffused, political solidarities around issues of human rights, women's equality, the defense of indigenous cultural communities, and ecological health have been consolidated. But globalization has also exacted a high price in the form of new and large inequities, the dilution of effective national sovereignty, and multiple insecurities. Among threats to human security arising from globalization the UNDP lists: economic insecurity, job and income insecurity, health insecurity, cultural insecurity, personal insecurity, environmental insecurity, political and community insecurity²³. The highly visible nature of these threats and inequities has given rise to

powerful criticism, which has found organized expression at public protests against the WTO (World Trade Organization) meeting in Seattle, November 1999.

Protesters included disparate environmental, labor, and consumer groups. European and U.S. consumer groups argued "that governments should put concerns about food safety above free trade"²⁴. In this complaint they were joined by environmentalists, who see free trade as blocking the institution of necessary environmental regulations worldwide. Other groups expressed a more explicitly political concern over the absence of democratic voices in the institutions of globalization representing interests other than those of large corporations or powerful governments.

In Seattle they protested "the closed-door nature of the WTO's decision-making, as well as what they see as its tendency to ride roughshod over the legislative process of local and national governments"²⁵. Similar resistance to elite international bureaucratic decision-making had led, in 1998 to the postponement of the Multilateral Agreement on Investment at the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development meeting in Paris. Labor union groups, in turn, accused the WTO, which in Seattle served as the targeted culprit symbolizing the general workings of globalization, of encouraging dumping (which, unions claim, destroy jobs "at home") and of failing to set "international labor standards that would prevent poor countries from using child labor, or lax labor laws, to lure jobs away from wealthy countries"²⁶.

Environmental irresponsibility, favouritism toward rich and powerful elite institutions, placing higher value on profitable trade over consumer safety and health, the destruction of jobs, the dilution of state sovereignty (in particular, control over the national economy and financial system) - these represent the broad array of general complaints levelled against globalization. Champions of globalization, and of its central prescriptions and practices -free

trade, liberalization, privatization - retort that these complaints are unfounded or exaggerated²⁷.

London's weekly *The Economist*, a highly articulate and influential advocate of globalization, protests loudly that more globalization is needed, not less, and that those who are hurt most by obstacles to free trade are the poor. A recent editorial enjoins us "to be clear about who would stand to lose most if globalization really were to be pushed sharply backwards -or, indeed, simply if further liberalization fails to take place. It is the developing countries. In other words, the poor"²⁸. The same editorial concedes that free trade is not a panacea and "is not likely to bring better welfare on its own". But it denies that free trade enriches multinationals or destroys the planet. On the contrary, says *The Economist*, with free trade and its growth since the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, "a new chance had arrived for the 5 billion poor to join the world economy and improve their lives. That chance remains. It must not be thrown away, amid the debris of Seattle"²⁹.

It must not be assumed, however, from the temporary coalitions formed at Seattle that the interests of all protesting groups are compatible. Europe and America have sharp disputes over protectionism in agriculture and over free trade in cultural goods. And large divergences between rich and poor countries over labor standards remain. Poor countries "resist the inclusion on the agenda of labor issues, which they see as a pretext for rich-country protectionism"³⁰.

Key disagreements

Disputes over the benevolence of globalization bring to the forefront a set of three broader and interconnected disagreements over development's present state: over the diagnosis to be made of the world's present uneven development, over evaluation of merits and demerits of development pathways pursued in recent decades, and over prescriptive directions in which to aim policy decisions in the short-term future.

Key disagreements center on four issues: First, should free trade and maximum integration into global competitive markets be promoted, or is selective integration around locally/ regionally/ nationally/ trans-regionally specific forms of endogenous (or auto-centric)³¹ development be sought?

Secondly, widening economic, financial, and technological integration into competitive global markets has adversely affected not only countries which have been the direct victims of financial collapse but several developed countries as well, notably in their ability to create remunerative employment and to provide governmental welfare services at an acceptable level.

Thirdly, should rapid and high levels of economic growth continue to be pursued, on the assumption that it is necessary for development, or should growth be restrained, or qualitatively altered, in order to assure environmental and social sustainability over the long-term? The dividing line, in economic theory, lies between advocates of environmental economics and those who see this... as a palliative, and who plead for a more biological, ecological system of economics in which inter-relational vitality (nature, humans, animals, technology) is the goal to be sought and not maximum economic enrichment - which they view as not a fully genuine form of wealth³².

Finally, should investment and resource transfer strategies be guided by global macro-economic concerns, or should more alternative, bottom-up development approaches be pursued, in recognition that these must not be confined to micro arenas but must gain purchase (in harmony with its values and institutional creations) on criteria of decision-making at work in meso and macro arenas? The question here is analogous to that raised by the British economist Raphael Kaplinsky, when studying what conditions are required for AT (appropriate technology) policies to be economically efficient as well as socially, politically, culturally, and environmentally appropriate. Kaplinsky concluded that state

macro policies must themselves be AT-enhancing for the more micro AT actions to yield proper developmental effects³³.

Something analogous is required here: macro-economic policies which promote integral sustainable human development, and not merely economic development, which may well prove to be not only unsustainable but humanly damaging beyond tolerable bounds. Macro-policies, including global policies, ought to be designed to be micro-developmental enhancing, where the premium can (in the right conditions) be placed on local definition of needs and control in ways that are economically and socially efficient.

A constellation of horizontal partnerships

Should internationally operating business corporations be viewed as the main agent or institutional actor in development, with governments, civil society organizations, and even international financial institutions viewed as their subordinate partners or facilitators? Or are novel constellations of horizontal partnerships engaging non-governmental organizations ("NGOs"), business firms, international agencies, and governments at several levels, and diverse civil society groups, the actors best suited to promote authentic sustainable development³⁴?

It is far from certain that even the ethically responsible conduct of business, even were it to become the general practice, can produce sound development. Profit-seeking and selecting the "basket of goods and services" to produce should be utilized by societal systems as stimulating and regulatory social mechanisms, not as organizing principles of economic activity. The entire realm of economic activity is instrumentally related to the goal of qualitative, multi-faceted human development.

It lies beyond the scope of this single essay to formulate extended answers to these four dyadic interrogations. They are listed here

to suggest what are the contours and the content of development debates in the present era of globalisation. For purposes of greater clarity, one may frame the key development questions in simple terms as follows: Is globalization good for development? How much globalization and operating under what rules of governance and in the pursuit of what ends? What kind of development does globalization, on the present model, generate: elitist, dependency-inducing, culturally destructive, socially disruptive, personally alienating, environmentally damaging development.

Or, conversely, is it development which is participatory, emancipating and liberating for the many, serving as a dynamic catalyst of regenerated cultural vitalities, conducive to social cooperation and environmentally sound for the long-term?

Rising tides sink small boats

Over the five and a half decades in which development has served as a propelling myth (in Sorel's³⁵ sense of a galvanizing idea which mobilizes people and institutions to make sacrifices in pursuit of it), the nature of development has evolved away from the quest for maximum economic growth, via targeted investment (public and private) and resource transfers. Investments and transfers were energized by state actions to plan, to provide incentives, and to create infrastructure around a threefold general goal: to modernize, to technologize, and to specialize. Initially there was at least an implicit assumption that wealth would be created rapidly and that it would trickle down in accord with the later dictum that "*a rising tide raises all ships.*"

Eventually it was learned that wealth does not trickle down and that rising tides sink small boats. Moreover, even economic growth itself did not occur everywhere (because social and political conditions were not propitious, because cultural and psychological determinants were absent or weak, because population pressure on resources was too great). In addition, institutional and political

modernization, and even technologically driven economic growth did not necessarily create employment. Worse still, economic and social (and qualitative human) disparities became more pronounced. Nor was poverty eliminated, notwithstanding significant advances in some countries, some sectors, some classes, some population groups.

Quite predictably, as the learning curve for development brought to light ever more numerous and ever more complex variables in the development equation – social, cultural, environmental, political, ethical – powerful assaults were launched on the very conception, the very project of development. Assaults were led in the name of post-modernism, of deep ecology, of liberation ideologies rejecting neo-forms of dependency attendant upon globalization, of ethically-based resistance to injustices and inequalities which seemed inseparable from the growth of some economic units. Notwithstanding the early rationales for growing inequalities provided by certain economic theorists, it became empirically evident over time that inequalities were not only durable but were growing wider.

The most recent assaults on globalization have come from cultural voices troubled by the apparent ineluctability with which globalization, and its attendant standardization, destroys cultural diversity and vitality, and the possibility for human communities to be genuine subjects of their own social history. Instead they are reduced to the status of objects, known and acted upon instead of actively knowing and acting. Hence their emphasis on local control, nay more, local decision-making reaching to the higher reaches of every people's putative "right" to define its own development paradigm.

Everyone's business

In the globalization age all these forces of assault, along with old and new forces of defense, converge. This convergence, rendered possible paradoxically by those same technologies which

have enabled financial and economic globalization to spread, comes at a time when the old development model (duly "corrected") is, in terms of available resources and institutional support (not least in the form of conceptual rationales) at its strongest.

On the development front there are now numerous new actors, or actors newly conscious of new roles for themselves (this is especially true of NGOs and what have come to be called institutions of civil society), as well as old actors rendered acutely conscious of lessened powers to influence events (governments) and others (business enterprises) become no less acutely conscious of their enhanced capacities to influence events in macro-domains they had previously not aspired to affect. The late Willis Harman, founder of the World Business Academy, wrote in 1990 that: "*Business has become, in this last half century,*

the most powerful institution on the planet. The dominant institution in any society needs to take responsibility for the whole – as the church did in the days of the Holy Roman Empire. But business has not had such a tradition. This is a new role, not yet well understood and accepted"³⁶.

Harman lamented that business firms were slow to accept the new role. A large constellation of other development actors, however, refuses to accept the new role as legitimate for business firms. A complete circle, regarding how one thinks about development may now have been closed.

Thirty years ago Paul G. Hoffman, the first Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme and the operating manager of the Marshall Plan, the largest developmental resource transfer effectuated, wrote that: "*just as politics is too important to be left entirely to*

politicians, development may well be too important to be left solely in the hands of 'developers'. Speaking both as the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme and as a private citizen who cares greatly about the future of his world, I say that development cannot and should not be the exclusive province of the 'experts' no matter how skillful or well-intentioned. It is too big, too complex, too crucial an undertaking not to merit the involvement – or at least the concerned interest – of the majority of people in every country on earth"³⁷.

Globalization has transformed into an empirical fact what Hoffman presented as an ethically desirable goal. After countless evolutions, development has now become everyone's business.

Denis Goulet

This article was first published in "The Social Dimensions of Globalization", before the different WSF (World Social Forum) assemblies in Porto Alegre and in Mumbai.

¹ - World Bank, *World Development Report 1992*, Oxford University Press, 1992 Overview, p.1.

² - World Commission on Environment and Development, *Our Common Future*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1987, p.89.

³ - Paul Streeten, *Future Generations and Socio-Economic Development – Introducing the Long-Term Perspective*, unpublished ms. dated January 1991, p.3.

⁴ - Paul Ekins, *Sustainability First*, in Paul Ekins and Manfred Max-Neef, editors, *Real-Life Economics*, London and New York: Routledge, 1992, p.412.

⁵ - Gilbert Rist, *the History of Development from Western Origins to Global Faith*, London and New York: Zed books, 1997, pp.212-213.

⁶ - L.-J. Lebreton and R. Moreux, *Economie et Humanisme* (Economy and Humanism), special issue, Feb./Mar. 1942

⁷ - Encyclical of Pope Paul VI on the progress of peoples and underdevelopment, 1967.

⁸ - L.-J. Lebreton, editorial of *Développement et Civilisations* (Development and Civilizations), no.1 (March 1961) p.3.

⁹ - Denis Goulet, "Une sagesse pour encadrer nos sciences", *L'économie humaine et la dynamique de développement à l'heure de la mondialisation*, Centre Lebreton, eds. Paris : UNESCO, 1998, p. 38-42.

¹⁰ - Max F. Millikan. „Planning Process and Planning Objectives in Developing Countries“ in *Organization, Planning and Programming for Economic Development*, US paper for the UN Conference on the Application of Science and Technology for the Benefit of the Less Developed Areas, Vol. VIII. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962, p. 33-34.

¹¹ - A typical specimen is the study prepared by Lebreton and his team for the Ministère du Plan, République libanaise, *Besoins et Possibilités de Développement du Liban*, Liban: Mission IRFED, 1960-1961, 3 volumes.

¹² - Barbara Ward, "Foreword", in Mahbub ul Haq, *The Poverty Curtain, Choices for the Third World*, New York: Columbia University Press 1976, p. 12.

¹³ - Karl Mannheim, *Freedom, Power and Democratic Planning*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1951, p. 151.

¹⁴ - John Kenneth Galbraith, *Economic Development in Perspective*, Harvard University Press, 1962, p.43.

¹⁵ - For a detailed presentation and justification of this typology of needs, see Denis Goulet, *The Cruel Choice*, New York : University Press of America, 1985, pp. 236-249.

¹⁶ - « Introduction » to Erich Fromm, ed., *Socialist Humanism: An International Symposium*, New York: Anchor Books, p.ix.

¹⁷ - No documents issued from the Marga seminar. This list is based on notes taken by the author at the Seminar.

¹⁸ - For a detailed analysis of how technologies favor, or impede, employment creation, see Raphael Kaplinski, *The Economies of Small, Appropriate Technology in a Changing World*, London : Appropriate Technology International, 1990.

¹⁹ - United Nations Development Programme, *Human Development Report*, 1991, New York: Oxford University Press, 1991, p. 5-6.

- ²⁰ – For detailed justification and illustration see Denis Goulet and Kwan S. Kim, *Estrategias de Desarrollo para el Futuro de Mexico*, Guadalajara, Mexico: ITESO, 1989
- ²¹ – Willy Brandt, *North South : A programme for Survival*, Cambridge, MA : MIT Press, 1980, p. 16.
- ²² – Thomas L. Friedman, *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*, New York : Farrar Straus Giroux, 1999, p. 7-8.
- ²³ – UNDP, *Human Development Report 1999*, New York : Oxford University Press, 1999.
- ²⁴ – « Seattle Is Under Curfew After Disruption, » *New York Times*, December 1, 1999, p. A14.
- ²⁵ – Ibid.
- ²⁶ – Ibid.
- ²⁷ – Typical examples are: C. Ford Runge with François Ortalo-Magne and Philip Vande Kamp, *Free Trade, Protected Environment*, New York: Council on Foreign Relations, 1994; Dani Rodrik, *The New Global Economy and Developing Countries: Making Openness Work*, Washington, DC: Overseas Development Council, 1999.
- ²⁸ – « The Real Losers », Editorial, *The Economist*, 11 December, 1999, p.15.
- ²⁹ – Ibid.
- ³⁰ – « A Global Disaster », *The Economist*, 11 December 1999, p. 19.
- ³¹ – Christine Gagnon, *La recomposition des territoires : développement local viable*, Paris : Ed. L'Harmattan, 1994 ; Bernard Dumas and Michel Séguier, *Construire des actions collectives : développer les solidarités*, Lyon : Chronique sociale, 1997.
- ³² – Anil Markandya and Julie Richardson, *Environmental Economics: A Reader*, New York : St. Martin's Press, 1992; Rajaram Krishna, Jonathan M. Harris, and Neva R. Goodwin, editors, *A Survey of Ecological Economics*, Washington, DC: Island Press, 1995.
- ³³ – Raphael Kaplinsky, *The Economies of Small: Appropriate Technology in a Changing World*, Washington DC: Appropriate Technology International, 1990.
- ³⁴ – Denis Goulet, « *Authentic Development, Is it Sustainable?* » in *Building Sustainable Societies*, Dennis C. Pirages, editor, Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, Inc, 1996, 189-205; Defining Wealth, Rethinking Development, Achieving Sustainability, *Humanomics*, 1999, 15:2/3, 42-59.
- ³⁵ – Georges Sorel, *Reflections on Violence*, New York: Collier Books, 1961.
- ³⁶ – Willis Harman, Statement reproduced on (Back Cover) *World Business Academy Perspectives*, Vol. 7, No. 3, 1993.
- ³⁷ – Paul G. Hoffman, Comment on Book Jacket of original edition of Denis Goulet, *The Cruel Choice, A New Concept in the Theory of Development*, New York, Atheneum, 1971. The Hoffman comment was written 18 months before the publication date.

FAITH AND DEVELOPMENT Registration number (for the French version) : 57163 - ISSN 0339 – 0462

Original French title "Foi et Développement" published since 1972 by the **Centre L. J. Lebret**.

(10 issues/year for the French version°. Only certain issues are available in English since 2001)

A list of published articles is available on request.

Editorial Board : Geneviève André, François Bellec (**assistant editor**), Pierre-Henri Chalvidan, Alain Durand, Maryse Durrer, Jacqueline Heinrich, Christine Join-Lambert (**secretariat**), Darwis Khudori, Serge Lafitte, Albert Longchamp (**editor**), Michel Lostis, Gabriel Marc, Emile Poulat, Sergio Regazzoni, Christian Rudel, Pierre Vilain, Richard Werly.

* Articles can be reproduced on the condition that the source is clearly indicated: (with the name and address of the Centre in addition).

* A copy of the publication where the article has been reprinted should be sent to the Centre .

Subscription rate : per issue : 4 € – 5 US\$ - 7 CHF
 Annual subscription : 38 € – 46 US\$ - 60 CHF
 Payments can be made by cheque in Euros to the order of the Centre L.-J. Lebret ; or by bank transfer:
 Postal Account (CCP France)- n° 20041 01012 3329712T 033 50 La Source (euros)
 Raiffeisen Bank Account (U.S.B.R. – CH 9001 St. Gallen, Switzerland)
 RAIFCH22 80181 74958.36 (CHF) or 74958.59 (US\$).

CENTRE INTERNATIONAL LEBRET-IRFED

Registered as an association under Swiss law, the Centre International Lebret-Irfed, together with its international network of development actors, undertakes research-action, training and other activities. The financing of the Centre's activities is assured through donations and subsidies received from persons as well as from public and private institutions.

The **Board of the Centre International Lebret-Irfed** is composed of the following:

President : Y. Berthelot - **Director** : S. Regazzoni - **Members**: C. Baehrel, J. Balbis, R. Colin, T. De Guia, M. De Melo-Foucher, S. Djuweng, J-F. Giovannini, Y. Glorieux, J. Heinrich, P. Houée, B. Huger, D. Khudori, L. Eung Kwark, B. Labaki, X. Lamblin, D. Lesaffre, A. Longchamp, M. Lostis, M.M'Baye, R.V. Mathias, R. Padrun, L. Razafimbelo, C. Roque, G. Sarazin, E. Sottas, B. Willot, F.M. Wolde.